

II. REMARKS

A. Status

Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11-13 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 11 are independent. Amendment at 2-6.

In the Office Action, claims 4-13, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Office Action at 2-3. Claims 1-3 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arimoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/00090449, hereinafter “Arimoto”). *Id.* at 3-11. Claims 4-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nitta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,027,018, hereinafter “Nitta”). *Id.* at 11-19.

In this Amendment, claims 4, 9-10, and 14-20 are cancelled, thus rendering rejections of those claims moot. Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 11 are amended to overcome applicable ones of the above-mentioned rejections. Amendment at 2-6.

Applicant respectfully submits that all remaining claims are allowable for the reasons set forth below.

B. Claims Are Not Indefinite

Claims 4-13, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Office Action at 2-3. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

First, of the claims rejected for being indefinite, claims 4, 9-10, 17, and 20 are cancelled herein, thus rendering the rejection moot. Amendment at 3-6.

Second, the Office Action indicated that the claims are rejected because, “n is not defined in the claims.” Office Action at 2. Accordingly, independent claim 11 is amended to define n: “the second clock signal is not being created every n ($n > 2$)....” *Id.* at 5. Because independent claim 11 now defines n, n is also defined for claims which depend from 11. Hence, claims 5-8 and 12-13 are also not indefinite.

C. Claims Are Not Anticipated

1. Claims 1-3 and 14-20 Are Not Anticipated By Arimoto

Claims 1-3 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arimoto. Office Action at 3-11. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

First, of the claims rejected for being anticipated by Arimoto, claims 14-20 are cancelled herein, thus rendering the rejection moot. Amendment at 6.

Second, independent claim 1 is not anticipated because Arimoto does not teach at least one limitation of claim 1.

In Arimoto, a tone voltage is estimated to carry out double gate driving for displaying data. Arimoto at [0032, *et seq.*]. However, it will be quite difficult to estimate a tone voltage for double gate driving of blanking data (black data). In this regard, the claims are different from Arimoto:

...the scan driver selects first n rows ($n > 2$) of pixels at a time, sequentially selects m rows ($m < n$) of second n rows of pixels, and selects pixels from the second n rows of pixels a plurality of times for each row during one frame period, then selects the first n rows of pixels and n rows of pixels adjacent the first n rows

of pixels at a time, then sequentially selects m rows of pixels for n rows of pixels adjacent the second n rows of pixels and selects n rows of pixels adjacent the second n rows of pixels a plurality of times for each row during one frame period;

Id. at 2. This limitation is not taught by Arimoto. Instead, Arimoto teaches that, “each of the gate lines (GL1 through GL12) on the liquid crystal panel 405 is selected twice during one frame period.” Arimoto at [190]. Thus, independent claim 1 is not anticipated.

Of course, dependent claims cannot be anticipated if the independent claim from which it depends is not anticipated. As discussed above, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Arimoto. Hence, dependent claims 2-3 are also not anticipated.

2. Claims 4-13 Are Not Anticipated by Nitta

Claims 4-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nitta. Office Action at 11-19. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

First, for the claims rejected for being anticipated by Nitta, claims 4, 9, and 10 are cancelled herein, thus rendering the rejection moot. Amendment at 3-5.

Second, applicant appreciates the Office Action language that identifies a potential solution to the § 102(e) rejection. However, Nitta does not anticipate independent claim 11 for substantive reasons and therefore the 1.131/1.132 solutions are not necessary.

Third, there occurs deterioration of display quality that resides in a specific difference of variation of capacitance between gate-source (capacitance variation between gate-source occurring on a specific line differs with each other, while data writing is after the previous line writing of the specific line and after the blanking data writing). Application at Fig. 6. It is not

possible to solve this problem using only the disclosure of Nitta. Claim 11 recites the following point:

...the control circuit outputs to the data driver blanking data other than the display data in place of the display data at timing at which the second clock signal is created immediately before the timing at which the second clock signal is not created...

Amendment at 5. This is not taught by Nitta. *See* Nitta at 7:45-8:3. Thus, independent claim 11 is not anticipated.

Of course, dependent claims cannot be anticipated if the independent claim from which it depends is not anticipated. As discussed above, independent claim 11 is not anticipated by Nitta. Hence, dependent claims 5-8 and 12-13 are also not anticipated.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11-13 are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



David A. Spenard
Registration No. 37,449

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 DAS:lcb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 3, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**